

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Application

Prior to the entry of this amendment, claims 1-11 were pending in this application. The Office Action rejected: (a) claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; and (b) claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Liao *et. al.* (U.S. 6292833, “the Liao reference”). Applicants herewith amends claims 1, 4-7 and respectfully traverse the other rejections and request reconsideration of this application. No subject matter was added.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 4-7 have been amended to identify “SMS” and “MMS”. The term “type” objected to in the Office Action has been deleted.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Applicants respectfully submit that the Liao reference does not disclose all of the claim elements of independent claim 1 of the present application.

More specifically, the Liao reference does not teach the step of “checking the authenticity of the user of the mobile station based on the request message received by the server”. The message processed by the methods described in the Liao reference is a message generated by a “remote service” and not a message generated by a mobile user. The Liao reference very specifically defines its methods as:

“According to the invention, before permitting access to local services of a mobile device, the identity of a remote service seeking to have the access is checked to determine whether the remote service is authorized for such access. If the remote service is authorized, then the access is permitted

and the remote service is able to execute or update the local services of the mobile device". (Liao et. al. , col. 2, line 29 –line 36)

In other words the methods of the Liao reference are concerned with evaluating a message from a remote server for the purpose of giving access to the phone of a mobile user. The message checked for authentication is not a request "composed on a mobile station" and "received by the server" as required by present claim 1. The authentication process of the Liao reference does not result in establishing the authentication of the mobile user. Instead, the authentication process of the Liao reference does establish the authentication of a remote server.

Further, the Liao reference does not teach the step of "if the authenticity of the user of the mobile station is confirmed, composing a text-based response message using a standard public text messaging protocol", as required by the present claim 1. The Liao reference is silent on steps of confirming the authenticity of the user of the mobile station and composing a text-based response message, if such authenticity is confirmed. The service identity referred to in the cited section of col. 7, lines 6-54 etc is the identity of the remote service requesting access to the mobile phone. It is not a mobile user requesting access to a server. Specifically The Liao reference states:

"On the other hand, when the decision block 312 determines that a match has been found, then the message (i.e., executable code) is executed 316 and thus able to access the local services of the mobile device". The execution 316 of the message is thus permitted to access the local services of the mobile phone to update, add, delete or otherwise alter the system parameters/data in the mobile device through the local services (Liao et. al. , col. 7, line 44 –line 47)

In other words, in the Liao reference there is no response message generated after the confirmation of the identity of the service. Instead, the response to a match of identity is to

give access to the mobile device and to update, add, delete or otherwise alter the system parameters/data. Hence, the Liao reference also fails to teach the step of “sending back to the mobile station said text-based response message”.

Further, the Liao reference does not teach the step of “authenticity checking performed by the private server”. In the Liao reference, the service identity is matched as part of the “mobile device message processing 300” as illustrated in Figs. 3A and 3B. The Liao reference states:

“The mobile device processing 300 is, for example, performed by the mobile device 102 illustrated in FIG. 1 (Liao et. al. , col. 6, line 24 –line 26)

The service identity in the Liao reference is thus performed in the mobile phone and not by a private server.

Further, the Liao reference does not teach that “the interaction between the private server and the mobile station is limited to the exchange of the text-based request message and the text-based response”. As already stated above, the Liao reference teaches to update, add, delete or otherwise alter the system parameters/data.

In view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that the Liao reference refers to a method where a server is given access to mobile phone for the purpose of upgrading the mobile phone software. The present invention relates to giving a mobile user access to information stored on a remote server. Apart from this fundamental difference, it is shown above that the Liao reference does not disclose all of the claim elements of independent claim 1 of the present application.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, the Liao reference does not teach that “the user unique identifier is a data related to the user of the mobile station”. The service identity of

the Liao reference identifies a remote server (see Fig. 1) and is not related to a user of a mobile device.

Regarding the rejection of claim 3, the Liao reference does not teach that “data related to the user of the mobile station is the lightweight directory access protocol alias of the user”. Contrary to the assertion of the examiner, the applicants could not establish in the Liao reference a disclosure of the “lightweight directory access protocol” also known as LDAP. The examiner is respectfully asked to indicate the exact citation on which the rejection is based.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4 and 6, the Liao reference discloses SMS type messages solely in connection with example of protocols. When disclosing the specific format of message sent from the remote server in col. 5, lines 14-15, there is no disclosure of the SMS format as the format of messages where the exchange between server and mobile station is limited to the exchange of the text-based request message and the text-based response.

Regarding the rejection of claims 5 and 7, and contrary to the assertion of the examiner, the applicants could not establish in the Liao reference a disclosure of MMS messages. The examiner is respectfully asked to indicate the exact citation on which the rejection is based.

Regarding the rejection of claim 8, and contrary to the assertion of the examiner, the applicants could not establish in the cited part of col. 4, line 27 – col 5, line 30 of the Liao reference a disclosure of specifically ciphered messages. The examiner is respectfully asked to indicate the exact citation on which the rejection is based.

Regarding the rejection of claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that the Liao reference does not disclose the concept of requested data and hence it is not clear where such data would be stored.

Regarding the rejection of claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that the Liao reference does not disclose the concept of identifying the user mobile station number.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that the Liao reference does not disclose the concept of a private network and does not disclose remote control commands for such private network.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

In the event that a fee or refund is due in connection with this Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No 19-0615. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 617-252-4735.

Respectfully submitted,


Jody Lynn DeStefanis
Registration No. 44,653

Date: Aug 14, 2006
Jody Lynn DeStefanis
Schlumberger Doll Research
36 Old Quarry Road
Ridgefield, Connecticut 06877-4108
Phone: (617) 252-4735
Facsimile: (203) 431-5640